DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 696 UD 015 737

AUTHOR Jesser, David L.
TITLE Education in the Big Cities: Problems and Prospects. Report No. 63.
INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY Improving State Leadership in Education, Denver, Colo.
REPORT NO ECS-R-63
PUB DATE Jun 75
NOTE 53p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Change Strategies; Consortia; *Cooperative Planning; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Problems; Interagency Cooperation; *Metropolitan Areas; Minority Group Children; Municipalities; School Community Cooperation; School Integration; *Urban Education; Urban Schools; Urban Teaching
IDENTIFIERS Suburban Migration; Urban Migration

ABSTRACT

Some of the current thinking on planning and effecting improvements in education in the big cities is together under four major chapters in this publication. A section on major developments, problems, and needs addresses such issues as accelerated rate of change, crisis confrontations and brush fire techniques, and unanticipated consequences of change. Four issues (educational leadership in the mainstream of society, dilemmas in big city education, recent developments and insights, and next steps) are included under a section on problems and challenges of big city education. Sub-issues such as migration of the disadvantaged, quality of education amid the process of ethnic desegregation of schools, accountability, and effective governance are also treated here. A section on preparing to meet the challenges and needs focuses on cooperative arrangements between groups, organizations, and agencies, planning and change, bringing schools closer to the people, and recognizing and removing constraints. The final section addresses emerging roles and relationships and discusses state education agencies, consortia of local administrators, institutions of higher learning, and intra-governmental efforts. It is concluded that cooperation throughout the entire governance system will continue to develop and improve the quality of the education programs. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118696

Education in the Big Cities

Problems and Prospects

Report No. 63

Written by David L. Jesser
Director
Career Education Project
Council of Chief State School Officers

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado 80203
Wendell H. Pierce, Executive Director

June 1975

UD015737

Financial support f om the Improving State Leadership in Education (ISLE) Project for the preparation of this report is gratefully acknowledged.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

it is difficult indeed to acknowledge assistance that has been proffered and gratefully accepted as this manuscript has been prepared. To the many people who have critiqued material and offered suggestions, my sincere thanks.

I would be remiss, however, if I failed to acknowledge certain specific kinds of assistance. The contributing authors to the volume, *Revitalizing Education in the Big Cities,* have been an extremely important source of help, as have the staff of the Education Commission of the States, who assumed responsibility for preparation of the case studies of state efforts to aid big city school systems. To the people at the Education Commission of the States, Gene Hensley and Ron Smith in particular, my appreciation for their support and constructive suggestions.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge the help of an esteemed colleague, respected mentor and valued friend, Edgar L. Morphet. To him, my sincere appreciation. Dr. Morphet was the director of the Improving State Leadership in Education (ISLE) Project at the time I served as associate director.

David L. Jesser
Director
Career Education Project
Council of Chief State School Officers

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter 1
MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS, PROBLEMS AND NEEDS 3

Accelerated Rate of Change 4

Crisis Confrontations and Brush Fire Techniques 4

Unanticipated Consequences of Change 5

Chapter 2
PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES OF BIG CITY EDUCATION 9

Educational Leadership in the Mainstream of Society 11
Equality of Opportunity and Educational Leadership 11
The Roots of the Problems 13
Educational Isolation 13
Migration of Disadvantaged Peoples 14
Out-Migration of Affluent Residents 15

Dilemmas in Big City Education 17
Quality Education Amid the Process of Ethnic Desegregation of Schools 17
New Visions Amid Massive Concentrations of Previously Bypassed People 19
Planning for the Future Amid Immediate Emergencies 19
Accountability Amid Deterrents 20
Burgeoning Necessities Among Dwindling Resources 22
Effective Governance and Obsolete Structures 23
Concentration and Coordination Amid Separated Endeavors 24

Some Recent Developments and Insights 25

Next Steps 27

Chapter 3
PREPARING TO MEET THE CHALLENGES AND NEEDS 28

Cooperative Arrangements 28
Some Possible Pitfalls 29

Planning and Change 30

Bringing Schools Closer to the People 33
The PACTS Program 34
The New York Effort 34

Recognizing and Removing Constraints 37

Chapter 4
EMERGING ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS 41

State Education Agencies 41

Consortia of Local Administrators 46

Institutions of Higher Learning 46

Intragovernmental Efforts 46

AFTERWORD 47

INTRODUCTION

During the past few years, many speakers and writers have directed attention to the increasingly serious problems of the big cities. In particular, most have commented on the acute problems of education and have noted that inasmuch as the more serious problems are closely interrelated, effective solutions will have to be interrelated as well. Numerous solutions have been proposed, but there have been relatively few attempts to develop comprehensive long-range plans for effecting improvements in most cities. Only limited progress has been made in reaching agreement on goals and priorities or on stratagies for ensuring that they are implemented promptly and effectively.

Meanwhile, the nation's metropolitan population continues to increase, and the problems are compounding. Within a few years, if current trends persist, three-fourths of the entire population will live in metropolitan areas. Our decisions relating to education finance and governance—along with a host of other decisions affecting metropolitan life—will significantly affect the destiny of the nation. We can neither afford to continue the unplanned growth of the past nor to enact piecemeal changes merely because they appear momentarily promising or are advocated by influential groups.

To say that urban problems are serious is, unfortunately, an understatement. The professional literature and the communications media show ample evidence that such problems are fast approaching crisis proportions. This evidence is not being presented by professional doomsayers, but by lay and professional leaders representing virtually every facet of society.

As often happens in crisis situations, long-range goals or objectives are at least temporarily forgotten. Moreover, decisionmakers confronted with such situations tend to overlook, or at least fail to recognize clearly, the root causes of the crisis.

As concerned citizens, including educators, legislators, government officials, parents and students, attempt to deal with the crises in big city governance and education, long-range goals must be kept in mind. Short-range goals, objectives and procedures must still be developed to surmount immediate problems, but they clearly need to be compatible with long-range goals. And, equally important, procedures will have to be developed for identification and resolution of the fundamental problems.

This publication brings together some of the current thinking on planning and effecting improvements in education in the big cities. It is a product of the cooperative efforts of many organizations and individuals. Primary impetus, however, has been provided by the recently completed project, Improving State Leadership in Education, by the Council of Chief State School Officers and by the Education Commission of the States.

Education renewal is essential for any significant progress in urban renewal. The kind and quality of education provided during the next few years will be a major factor in improving conditions in the cities. If we are to remedy the ills of our metropolitan centers, we must correct the inadequacies of education policies and programs in those centers. Cooperative endeavors on a scale seldom witnessed before will be needed. All agencies, institutions and organizations concerned with education governance will have to become involved in the search for solutions.

The need is urgent. The time for action is *now*.

Edgar L. Morphet
Byron W. Hansford
Wendell H. Pierce*

*Edgar L. Morphet is professor emeritus, University of California at Berkeley; Byron W. Hansford is executive secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers; and Wendell H. Pierce is executive director, Education Commission of the States.

Chapter 1

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS, PROBLEMS AND NEEDS

Throughout its history, the United States has experienced many important changes in its structure of government, its geography, its peoples and its society. In retrospect, most of the changes were probably more beneficial than detrimental. Hence, most members of the society have accepted change and perceived change as "good." This has been especially true as long as the changes exhibited two basic characteristics:

- A perceived quality of orderliness; and
- A reflection of some notion of social progress.

In this setting, the United States grew from a relatively small, agricultural nation to one of the most powerful and highly developed countries in the world. Vast changes occurred, and these changes, at least in the eyes of society, were considered necessary for the growth of the nation.

More recently, however, increasing numbers of Americans have been reluctant to perceive change *per se* as either orderly or beneficial. Some changes formerly seen as boons have rapidly become sources of many societal ills. Growth in metropolitan areas, development and accessibility of private modes of transportation and the development of heavy industry and big business were perceived as good. Many people now living can remember thinking of such changes in a positive and favorable manner.

Yet today, as our society faces unprecedented problems and upheavals, many of those who formerly viewed change with anticipation and satisfaction can no longer do so. And it is primarily here—in the kinds of change heretofore perceived as good for society—that the root causes of urban problems are found. What has hap-

pened? How did the present situation develop? What are some probable consequences? How can undesirable consequences be avoided?

Accelerated Rate of Change

Men and women born in the early decades of the 20th century have participated in almost unimaginable breakthroughs in virtually every aspect of societal life. In their lifetimes they have watched transportation develop from the horse and buggy to the Boeing 747 and beyond. They have observed what can only be termed fantastic developments in communcations—the telephone, radio, television, satellite technology and now the laser. Instantaneous communication with almost every area of the earth is now only possible, but is accepted as an essential way of life. Our society has witnessed dramatic breakthroughs in the fields of energy production, medical and health care, and delivery and information systems.

While the value of these changes must not be overlooked or minimized, it must be balanced against their sudden evolution which has contributed to many of society's problems. The rapid pace of change has all but eliminated the desideratum of "orderliness" in change. At the same time, we see more clearly than ever before the undesirable consequences of unplanned change. There is an apparent inability or unwillingness among decisionmakers to deal appropriately with the rapid manner in which changes are occurring. More and more citizens are expressing concern about the consequences—to society in general and to individual human beings in particular—of either unplanned or poorly planned change.

Crisis Confrontations and Brush Fire Techniques

In an interview reported recently, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger observed that America's major problem is that it directs its attention primarily to immediate problems. The real necessity, according to Kissinger, "is for discipline and foresight to carry out necessary measures that cannot in advance be proven to be necessary."[1]

In the interview, Secretary Kissinger was reflecting on

[1] *Time*, October 21, 1974, p. 72.

problems faced by the United States in a modern-day global community of nations. When he observed that "there is a need for farsightedness of governments to an unusual degree," he could also have been referring to state governments, local governments or local systems of education. Most of these administrative systems, caught up in wave after wave of crises, have been so concerned with the immediate problems created by crises that they have not been able to develop long-range goals.

These observations do not imply that we should overlook immediate problems. Brush fires, if not contained, can become raging conflagrations; infectious disease, if not controlled, can result in epidemics or plagues; and social problems, if not remedied or alleviated, can foment upheavals of great moment. It is obvious that immediate problems must be solved, and that to do so will require a continuing high expenditure of energy and resources. At the same time, however, we must institute long-range goals to lessen the probability of crises occurring in the future.

It may be difficult to keep long-range goals and objectives in mind when dealing with immediate crises, but failing to do so is likely to result in a future comprised primarily of crises. Whether our society could do more than merely exist in such a future is open to serious question.

Unanticipated Consequences of Change

How can a society cope with the unanticipated consequences of change? Consider the breakthroughs that have occurred in recent years in the areas of science, technology and general knowledge. Each of the breakthroughs, together with a series of serendipitous effects or spin-offs, has resulted in heretofore unimagined benefits for mankind and provided society with invaluable insights and opportunities. They have also caused society to take more seriously the concept of the worth, dignity and integrity of the individual and have provided society with the tools necessary to build upon that concept. Clearly, as these breakthroughs occur, society could anticipate many beneficial results.

Yet there were, and continue to be, consequences of those changes that were not anticipated. Unfortunately, many of these consequences have been counterproductive: poverty in the midst of affluence; inequitable rights and opportunities based upon race, ethnic origin and sex; a population explosion reflected in the growing density of urban centers; and more recently, ecological concerns relative to the use and misuse of essential resources. Perhaps the most serious dilemma of all is the relationship between growth and progress. In this particular dilemma, many of the root causes of the perplexing problems of society can be found.

For many Americans, the idea that most societal problems are linked to big cities is apt to be incongruous and inexplicable. Many of us grew up in a society in which bigness and goodness were synonomous. Progress was conceptually tied to bigness. It was only natural for Americans to turn to the big cities in their search for the good life. The bigger the city was, the better it was expected to become; and the better it became, the bigger it grew. This was envisioned as the saga of the big city.

Viewed in retrospect, the concept of bigness and goodness as being synonomous should not be puzzling. As the nation grew in physical area, settled areas and population, it became "better." Businesses and industries, as they moved from small shops and home factories to great skyscrapers and huge factories, likewise became "better." Throughout our history, the concept has been: the more there is and the bigger it is, the better it will become.

It is not surprising that more and more people turned to the cities. Bigness meant goodness, and cities were big. Therefore, big cities and big city life were considered good. And the perception was not altogether false in some respects.

During that period, the ultimate in housing, with its electric lights and its indoor plumbing, was to be found in the cities, readily available to industrious people willing to work diligently for it. Cities offered the latest

in public transportation – subways, streetcars and buses. And it was in the big city, with its businesses and factories, that conscientious and hard-working individuals could climb upward, as many did, on the ladder of success.

As one result, small cities grew into big cities, and big cities developed into bigger cities. And with bigger cities came a need for expanded social institutions and agencies. New and larger hospitals, police departments, fire departments and schools came into being. The wisdom of the people in equating bigness with goodness seemed apparent. It was, after all, in the big city that the finest medical care, the most modern protective services and the greatest education opportunities were readily available. The fulfillment of the American Dream presumably was to be found in the city.

But as the nation and its cities grew, it slowly and painfully became apparent that growth could lead to something other than goodness and that bigness and goodness were not necessarily synonomous. But while ominous signs were clearly visible to some, to others those same indicators were only irritating conditions that stood temporarily in the way of progress. At the half-way point of the 20th century, there were conflicts between orderly growth and chaotic sprawling, between aspirations and realizations, and between existing and living. Those conflicts have, in many instances, erupted into highly visible and volatile crisis situations.

In the waning years of the 20th century, the urban settings of America are rocked by one crisis after another, each compounding the preceding one. Virtually every social institution has been seriously affected. And while the crises have been identified with urban centers, the impact is felt far beyond the big cities. As Haskew has observed:

> . . . the pitfall we face is failing to recognize that crisis in big cities is crisis in the United States. . . . As always, crisis is a compound of opportunity and peril. The job ahead for [all] governments is to aggrandize opportunity at the expense of peril.[2]

[2] L. D. Haskew, "Big City Education: Its Challenge to Governance," in *Revitalizing Education in the Big Cities*, p. 4.

If the crises confronting urban life are to be alleviated, strong and farsighted leadership must be exerted at all levels of government and in all segments of society. People will again need to perceive appropriate change and growth as having potential benefits, and they must also learn to live with both change and growth, for both will continue to occur.

But how is this to be accomplished? What tools can be employed? In examining these questions, Haskew has suggested that:

> No single one will suffice, of course. *Neither will uncoordinated use of multiple tools.* The experience of the last 50 years, however, convincingly urges that *education has to be one key constituent of targeted strategies to exploit opportunities and to dampen disintegration.* Systems of schools existing in big cities alone cannot solve any problem or exploit any opportunity composing our crisis. But, *it is hard to identify any problem or opportunity that* will yield without key inputs from those school systems.[3]

Americans look to education for solutions to many of society's problems and expect public education to assume a leadership role in bringing about constructive change in all parts of our rapidly changing, dynamic and complex social system. Can education—big city education—provide the help that is needed? Or will it be too caught up in its own struggle for survival to make the contributions so urgently needed?

---

[3]Ibid., p. 4.

Chapter 2

PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES OF BIG CITY EDUCATION

Until a few decades ago the best education opportunities and programs were usually found in the cities, and the least satisfactory in rural and small town areas. Most cities were relatively wealthy, could attract the best educational talent and did not need, or recognize the need, for state services and assistance. The states and state education agencies were concerned primarily with education in rural and small town areas, where most of the people lived. They were not in a position, and seldom were asked, to provide services or much financial assistance for the schools in the cities.

But since World War II, the situation of most cities has changed significantly in many respects, including the following:

- For some years there was a tremendous migration to the cities, including blacks from the South, poor whites from Appalachia and Puerto Ricans and others from Latin America, all seeking better economic and education opportunities.

- More recently, many of the most affluent people, especially affluent whites in the cities, began to move to wealthier suburban areas to find a "better" environment and escape the rapidly increasing problems in the cities.

- Few of the city school systems, which had tended to become complacent and bureaucratic, were prepared to cope adequately with new education problems or to meet the needs of new students, most of whose families were from low-socioeconomic groups that had limited education opportunities.

Many people thought the problems in the cities were only temporary and could be resolved by traditional relations and procedures. Gradually, urban, state and national leaders recognized that the situation would continue to deteriorate unless appropriate new policies and procedures were developed, accepted and utilized perceptively. They recognized that there was indeed a crisis affecting the welfare and progress of the nation and that no simple changes would suffice to resolve the situation. Bold and comprehensive planning was essential and would require the insights and services of the most competent people from all levels as well as the cooperation and support of the cities, the states and the federal government.

Plausible answers to the dilemmas of modern-day society are to be found, in part, in the societal inputs that can be provided by the big city school systems. It is therefore imperative that the potential leadership be nurtured and brought into full bloom. The style of leadership must necessarily be somewhat different from what it often was in the past. The big city school systems that flourished in the past did so primarily as a result of the contributions of perceptive education leaders. But if the complex problems of today's big city school systems are to be solved, education leaders will be called upon to provide strong leadership for all aspects of the social system—not just in the education sector.

The new leadership must be able to work with and through the many segments of society. It will be essential that the new leadership be able to:

- Accurately assess the needs of a changing society in relation to the value systems formulated and held by members of that society;
- Adequately explore alternative strategies that hold promise of meeting or fulfilling the identified societal needs;
- Guide the development of rational, realistic and viable operational plans for the effective utilization of resources in light of available alternatives; and

- Provide assistance to the various groups responsible for implementing the plans developed to meet societal needs.

Educational Leadership in the Mainstream of Society

Implicit in effective leadership is the need for rapport and cooperation between all segments of society, and this rapport and cooperation is most needed among the several discrete components of municipal, county and state governance. Education, it must be remembered, is only one of the many components of governance. There will have to be an intertwining of leadership in the big cities if rational answers to societal problems are to be found. It is no longer possible or desirable for education to be an autonomous segment of society. It must operate where it rightfully belongs, in the mainstream of society; it must not function in its own channel that may not be closely related to the mainstream.

Equality of Opportunity and Educational Leadership

The accomplishment of all the tasks requiring the new kind of leadership needed in education relates directly to the concept—long held and cherished by all Americans—of equal opportunity for all. Recognition and acceptance of this concept is fundamental to the democratic system of values that has evolved and emerged in this nation. The new leadership cannot be exempted from such recognition and acceptance. The leadership in education, especially in the big cities, will need to demonstrate a firm and positive commitment to equal opportunity. The education leaders in the big cities will have to demonstrate, through appropriate actions, that they actually believe what they say they believe. In effect, they will have to work diligently to reduce the gap between what we say and what we do—the actions taken or not taken in support of the professed beliefs.

As a case in point, this nation has long held that a broadly based and adequately supported system of public education is essential to its well-being and preservation. This same society has held that, consistent with a belief in the dignity and worth of each individual, every child should be given equal opportunity in the publicly supported school system to develop his or her

talents to the fullest extent possible within the wide range of abilities and needs.

Until relatively recent times, most Americans believed that equal opportunity was being achieved through the schools. But in a system that was concerned primarily with teaching the "3 R's," with preparing students for the next step in education or with merely transmitting from one generation to the next those social and cultural heritages deemed to be of value, the fallacy of adherance to the traditional concept of equality of opportunity can readily be perceived.

Obviously, there has long been a professed belief in the concept of equality of opportunity. Perhaps not so obvious, however, has been the reluctance of society—through its leadership—to demonstrate, through its actions, its support of that belief.

A dynamic, mobile and expanding society cannot tolerate an education system that is limited in purpose and scope or that does not genuinely make meaningful efforts to meet the needs of all segments of society. Public education must adequately serve those who possess a wide-ranging variety of learning styles, abilities and needs. This is imperative in every facet of education, but is especially important in the big city school systems, where most of the population, divergent learning styles and diverse needs are found. It is in these systems that failure to accommodate divergent abilities and needs is noticeable, as indicated in a recent measurement of educational achievement among young Americans.[1]

If public education is to provide meaningful education opportunities to match the abilities and needs of *every* learner, instead of *selected* learners, the patterns, programs and organizational structures that once were acceptable no longer will suffice. As they develop new and diversified programs, education leaders will do well to question the assumption that each generation will live amid conditions that governed the lives of its fathers.

---

[1] "National Assessment Results to Date," in *ERS Bulletin*, October 1974. Educational Research Service, Inc., Arlington, Va.

Changes that have occurred in society must be recognized; changes likely to occur must be anticipated.

The Roots of the Problems

A recent publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, *Blueprint for the Possible*, noted that educators, in their haste to find the proper solution, were often prone to jump right over the problem. This may have been the case to some degree as education leaders have attempted to deal with the problems of the big city schools.

But if many educators have tended to overlook the problems, they certainly were not alone. The problems often developed in a gradual, subtle manner. And it must be kept in mind that school systems in the big cities, as they evolved and developed over the years, were able to move away from the more traditional and limited programs to more diversified programs. Big city school systems were able to do much to meet the needs of the different kinds of learners served. Indeed, until only a few decades ago, the very best in education opportunities and programs were found in the big city school systems. As noted previously, the big cities enjoyed the greatest concentrations of wealth and had the greatest resources available for education. Wealth, together with the drawing power of the city as a center of culture, enabled big city school systems to attract and employ the best in educational talent.

Educational Isolationism. Ironically, this combination of great wealth and educational talent gave rise to one of the major problems of big city schools. The seemingly unlimited resources and a never-ending supply of education expertise made it possible for big city school systems to exist in "splendid isolation" from many other segments of the education system. The big city school systems were virtual empires unto themselves. They did not need any help from other agencies concerned with education. Harold Spears, an administrator who has seen the transformation of big city school systems, has eloquently described the situation that enabled those systems to enjoy their isolation:

> As we recall, the large city school district was highly independent of the state educational agency, both fiscally and pedagogically. In a true sense it was an operation that so often overshadowed the state office. Major funding of education was largely the property tax that tended toward district individualism, and in the case of the large city meant ample coffers for the chest.[2]

In recent years there has been increasing awareness on the part of big city school systems of the need for cooperative relationships between those systems and other education agencies. Increasingly, big city school systems have turned to other education institutions and agencies for assistance in finding practical solutions for the maze of problems confronting them. They have sought assistance from institutions of higher learning, from state education agencies and from various agencies of the federal government.

To some observers, however, the recognition by the big city school systems of the need for help has been somewhat akin to closing the barn door after horses have gotten away. The problems—overlooked while developing—became critical before assistance was sought. Until the crisis, big city school systems remained comfortable with their sense of security, well-being and isolation.

Migration of Disadvantaged Peoples. Prior to World War II, the sense of security held by many of the education system was enhanced by the fact that the expanding economy of the big cities could accommodate the influx of many kinds of people. In this context, it should be noted that in the years immediately preceding and during World War II, the nation and its industry located in the big cities enjoyed tremendous growth stimulated by the general recovery that followed the depression of the 1930s. The big cities and the industries needed people, and every effort was made to recruit them. This was quite logical, because it was through this same kind of growth that the cities had been able to develop as they did. So the influx of people and growth of industry continued, and the big cities continued to thrive, or at

[2] Harold Spears, "The City Sheikdoms of the Past," p. 5. Unpublished paper prepared for the Education Commission of the States.

least to fare better than most other geographic and demographic aspects of the society.

In the years since World War II, however, the situation in the big cities has changed dramatically. To many disadvantaged groups, including economically distressed blacks from the Deep South, whites from the Appalachian region, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and others, big cities continued to hold the promise that they once held for many other disadvantaged immigrants. To these groups of peoples, the big city was the "promised land," where they and their families could find their own "place in the sun" and where the answers to their own problems could be found.

As one result, the number of migrants to the big cities increased dramatically and has continued to increase in the three decades since the end of World War II. And as the number of migrants to the big cities increased, so did the problems of big city education.

As pointed out earlier, many of emerging problems in the big cities were so gradual and subtle as to be relatively unnoticeable. And, as has been observed many times, the last gift of the gods seems to be foresight. It would be grossly unfair, however, to suggest that there were no concerns about the migration of disadvantaged groups to metropolitan centers. Nearly a decade ago, sociologists attempted to direct attention of educators to this as well as other population trends. In a perceptive and thought-provoking paper by Phillip Hauser and Martin Taitel, for example, the problem was clearly identified and reasonable guidelines were suggested.[3] Unfortunately, little action resulted.

Out-Migration of Affluent Residents. As Hauser and Taitel were examining population trends and projections, especially those having implications for the large cities, they called attention to the fact that, while the population influx presaged rough times for the cities, a

[3]Phillip Hauser and Martin Taitel, "Population Trends—Prologue to Educational Problems." Chapter 3 in *Prospective Changes in Society by 1980,* Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan, eds. New York: Citation Press, 1967.

countermovement of equal importance was also taking place. As they described it:

> Persons of the lowest income, education and occupational status, *usually the newcomers to the urban environment,* tended to occupy the less desirable residences toward the center of the city. Persons of higher income, education and social status tended to locate toward the peripheries of the metropolis. [Emphasis supplied.][4]

It was largely during the years after World War II that the exodus of affluent residents from central cities to surrounding suburbs gained its greatest momentum. As Haskew has observed:

> These inhabitants [of the large cities] themselves are in constant motion; centrified in nature. They move to suburbs at dizzying rates and are followed by business services and industry. The suburban rings thus created continue their outward expansion. . . . By 1990, it is likely that 60 per cent of the metropolitan population will be in the suburban rings—still moving outward. In the central cities, people are in constant movement also; individual schools often show 40, 60, even 100 per cent enrollment turnovers in a school year.[5]

The issues raised by Hauser and Taitel and later by Haskew point to deficiencies and imbalances that have become glaringly apparent in recent years. One need only journey through the central portion of any large American city to observe firsthand the consequences of migrations to and from our cities. There is an unmistakable atmosphere of obsolescence and decay in the inner cities, gaping holes where buildings used to be and, where buildings are still standing, boards where windows were. Most important, however, is that in the midst of the decay of the inner city—with its substandard housing conditions that constitute a national disgrace—there are *people.* Perhaps, as Hauser and Taitel have indicated,

> . . . it is likely that the physical and socioeconomic character of a community in the future will depend less on the historical accident of its origin and more upon the will of

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

[5] Laurence D. Haskew, "Big City Education: Its Challenge to Governance," in *Revitalizing Education in the Big Cities,* Edgar L. Morphet, David L. Jesser and Arthur P. Ludka, eds. Denver, Colo.: Improving State Leadership in Education, 1972, p. 3.

> organized population groups as manifest in the planning and development activities.[6]

Dilemmas in Big City Education

The preceding paragraphs have described briefly some of the challenges confronting education in the big cities and the root causes of some of the basic problems that have emerged. Many other challenges and problem areas could have been noted; these, however, seem basic.

Some big city school systems have been able to provide the needed leadership to work effectively with other social agencies in the urban environment. While there are problems in most school systems today, concerned educators, legislators, parents and other citizens are engaged in efforts that hopefully will lead to solutions. As already noted, however, there is a potential danger in seeking solutions too rapidly: it is always possible that the problem itself will be overlooked.

In his examination of the plight of big city schools, Haskew delineated seven concerns (discussed below) that constitute the major issues confronting education in the big cities.[7] Each is a problem area of utmost importance, with significant implications for concerned citizens searching for solutions.

Concern: Quality Education Amid the Process of Ethnic Desegregation of Schools

Throughout the history of the nation, high quality education for *everyone* has been the persistent American dream. Dochterman and Beshoar have depicted the dream in terms of

> . . . a land in which every citizen would have the opportunity for a richer and fuller life, with education opening the doors to opportunities designed to enable each youngster to reach his [or her] maximum potential.[8]

Although it may not have been technically possible to provide "quality education" for everyone in the recent

[6] Hauser and Taitel, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

[7] Laurence D. Haskew, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-19.

[8] Clifford Dochterman and Barron Beshoar, in *Directions to Excellence in Education.* Denver, Colo.: Improving State Leadership in Education, 1971, p. 4.

past, Americans are now in a position to provide, with their available insights and technologies, appropriate education opportunities for everyone. But as these insights and technologies have become available, school systems across the nation have become involved in another manifestation of the problem of providing quality education for everyone—the process of integrating the schools.

The processes of desegregation and integration in the schools are far from complete. They have either been highly successful or abysmal failures to date, depending somewhat on one's frame of reference. But it is readily apparent that desegregation is shaking the foundations of quality education in the big city schools. And as these events take place, there is notable evidence of problems in areas such as:

- Viable governance;
- Deployment of energy and manpower;
- Aspects of schooling preoccupying professional staffs and boards of education;
- Fiscal resources and their utilization;
- Staffing;
- School district structure for the metropolis;
- Time and talent for curriculum renewal;
- Acts and technologies for teaching and learning;
- Planning for upward development;
- Supportive assistance from other governmental programs such as housing, urban renewal and model neighborhoods; and
- Commitment and emotional support from the community for its schooling organization.[9]

[9] Laurence D. Haskew, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

Concern: New Visions Amid Massive Concentrations of Previously Bypassed People

As has been noted, the technologies and insights available to the nation's education system have made quality education for all a real and viable possibility. The American Dream can become a reality. For the dream to become a reality, however, leaders in both education and governance will have to concern themselves more with the problems of *people*, and less with the data generated by statistics and percentages.

The need for information will always remain. But a fixation on "headcount statistics" should not mean that the needs of all learners are forgotten or overlooked. There is also the possibility that when only "headcount statistics" are used, many people will be bypassed—and many have been. These bypassed people have been concentrated, in large measure, in the big cities, where they constitute a large segment of the education program, and at the same time, a large part of the problem.

Concern: Planning For the Future Amid Immediate Emergencies

The concept of planning for a desired future is both accepted and supported by most educators. For some, such planning, however necessary, may be perceived as being out of touch with the reality of the present-day situtation. The crises constitute very real problems, as the late Marcus Foster pointed out in a presentation to the Council of Chief State School Officers:

> The economic plight of [many] families who send children to our schools is staggering. During the past five years we have seen the number of children from AFDC families rise from 10,000, or about 16 per cent of [the Oakland] elementary and secondary enrollment, to more than 24,000, or 38 per cent. . . .
>
> In a $68 million budget our projected 1971-72 deficit is $3.5 million with no provision for cost-of-living adjustments for our employee groups. To balance our budget we have been obliged to cut 150 classroom teacher positions, 5 principals, 2 vice-principals, 7 nurses and 48 positions in an already depleted custodial/maintenance staff. We have also made substantial reductions throughout all areas of the instructional and supportive program. Thus, when our teachers return to school this fall (if indeed they can be

persuaded to return) they will find significantly larger numbers of children in their classrooms, and they will not have the materials, the books and the other supplies that they will need to help these children achieve.[10]

Similar situations are found in most big city school systems. In the face of such crisis areas, it would be understandable if the administrators of such systems were most concerned with taking care of the here and now, and with "keeping their heads above water." But, as Haskew has observed, planning ahead by school districts in big cities does occur, in spite of brinkmanship. Haskew has further commented on a flaw that perhaps exists in many planning efforts: projecting the past and the present into the future, which can happen in the absence of a priority-targeted development-span plan.[11]

Concern: Accountability Amid Deterrents

At the present time the concept of accountability is riding on the crest of favorable public opinion. When blended into practice, the concept holds considerable promise for rectifying imbalances in the education system of the big cities. But as education leaders proceed in their efforts to improve the education lot of learners and make the school systems truly accountable, they are encountering several pitfalls.

One of the major pitfalls has been related to the definition of accountability. As noted, everyone favors accountability. But what is it they favor? Vlaanderen and Ludka have observed that:

- Legislators may believe that schools are accountable to the legislature because it appropriates money for school operations.

- Congressmen may believe that education should be accountable for the manner in which federal monies are expended in school programs.

---

[10] Marcus Foster. "Urban Education as a Problematic Situation," in *Management of the Educational Enterprise.* Report of the 1971 Institute for Chief State School Officers.

[11] Laurence D. Haskew, *op. cit.* pp. 12-13.

- Educators are likely to believe that legislators should be held accountable for the manner in which they provide (or do not provide) financial support for the schools.

- Lay citizens are likely to say that schools should be accountable to the taxpayers.

- Others might suggest that schools should be accountable to students.[12]

Most people agree that educators and education should be accountable. The agreement tends to become fragmented, however, when issues such as "Who should be accountable for what?" and "To whom should the schools be accountable?" are raised.

Closely related to the pitfall of definition is the issue of *responsibility*. As long as people are free to select a definition which best fits their own needs and perceptions, it will also be possible for them to reject those aspects with which they might disagree. They have the option to say, "Accountability is fine for those students and school systems over there, but not in our situation."

Definition and responsibility are by no means the only pitfalls that school systems have encountered in their efforts to achieve accountability in education. The machinations of bureaucratic structures found in most big city school systems through their numerous and complex communications arrangements have made accountability in any aspect of education difficult to establish.

Another problem related to education accountability has developed concurrently with teacher unions, teacher militancy and a shifting focus of professional educational organizations. As in situations described earlier, there is an apparent tendency for teacher organizations to agree readily with the concept of accountability so long as it is directed at "the others."

---

[12] Russell Vlaanderen and Arthur Ludka, "Education in a Changing Society," in *Emerging State Responsibilities for Education*, Edgar L. Morphet and David L. Jesser, eds. Denver, Colo.: Improving State Leadership in Education, 1970. pp. 140-141.

Concern: Burgeoning Necessities Among Dwindling Resources

It should be eminently clear that additional resources are needed by school systems of the big cities if their many complex problems are to be resolved. Many existing programs must be revised, and new types of programs must be developed and utilized. New programs must address the relationship between the education received by the students and the work they will perform for a living. To provide the needed programs will require the expenditure of a substantial amount of funds. The pay-off, however, could be tremendous.

Other areas in which additional resources are needed, if the task at hand is to be accomplished, relate to construction and maintenance of adequate facilities, protection services, communications and equipment. To bring just one of these—school facilities—to a par with the facilities of suburbia will require, in many large-city school systems, outlays of hundreds of millions of dollars. Similar major outlays will be required to keep every aspect of education in the big cities on the right road.

Unfortunately, as the need for resources in the big cities has skyrocketed, the actual or existing supply of available resources has tended to wither away. Consider the dilemma posed by Dr. Foster:

> I would have to state, however, that an even greater challenge to urban education exists today. I have reference here, of course, to the crucial matter of the adequate financing of our schools.
>
> For example, in our district we have had serious financial problems for the past several years since our revenues have not kept pace with steadily increasing costs and demands for needed additional programs. Our local tax ceiling has not changed since 1958. In the past we have been able to balance our budgets by reducing or eliminating central office services and by drastically curtailing our maintenance and custodial staffs.[13]

The situation in Oakland, as described by Dr. Foster, may or may not be typical. It does, however, point to a critical need for a better balance between resources and

[13] **Marcus Foster**, *op. cit.*

demands. The urgent need was emphasized in even more dramatic fashion when Dr. Mark Shedd, then superintendent of schools for Philadelphia, suggested before a Congressional hearing that perhaps the big city systems should be nationalized and that the federal government should assume responsibility for keeping available resources and the necessities in better balance.[14]

Concern: Effective Governance and Obsolete Structures

The tasks confronting education in big cities are indeed great, and herculean efforts will be required if they are to be accomplished satisfactorily. But the tasks themselves will have to be accomplished with the cooperation of other governmental agencies. Education endeavors in many big cities face probable failure if they are not better structured and orchestrated. Organizational structures that once seemed adequate will no longer suffice; new or reorganized structures must be developed. This point, suggested earlier in this monograph, has been emphasized by Haskew.

> In big cities, governance for schooling has to be intertwined with governance for everything else to be even modestly effective in surmounting the big problems, and action in concert is always much more difficult than action in solo [and] as has been brought out repeatedly, governance for big city school systems must cope with a plethora of organized pressures and forces that add tremendous new dimensions to being effective at all.[15]

Effective governance of education in the big cities will require different kinds of leadership than many cities have had in the past. The education leader in the big cities must "know the territory." Unless the territory is known, and unless the education leader is cognizant of certain "givens," any attempt to orchestrate the needed endeavors will be disharmonious at best. To illustrate some of the "givens" that must be recognized:

- School district boundaries are often more destructive than constructive in their locations and/or their impenetrability.

[14] Testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Washington, D.C., September 21, 1971.

[15] Laurence D. Haskew, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.

- Comprehensive planning for such vital program features as employability education is often blocked by jurisdictional complexity.

- Organizational structures for school system management can be tall and rigid structures that seem to thwart the most sincere efforts to diffuse decision-making.

- Those who profit from centralized control of schools are often strongly entrenched and can wield powerful sanctions against community control, calling state statutes or union contracts to their aid.

- Local political and economic power structures all too often use their muscle to exploit the school system for jobs and contracts, and all too seldom support efforts to make pupil achievement the measure of effectiveness in governance.[16]

Though there are other aspects of "the territory" with which the educational leader in the big city should be familiar, the ones cited above for illustration purposes should suffice and should engender a greater appreciation of all aspects of "the territory."

Concern: Concentration and Coordination Amid Separated Endeavors

In recent years much has been written about the pluralistic nature of the American society, and many have attributed the perceived ills of society—especially in the big cities—to the various manifestations of pluralism in society. That pluralism exists is unarguable. It does exist, has existed and will continue to exist. But to attribute all the problems of society to it does the concept of pluralism an injustice. Pluralism, by definition, refers to

> a state of society in which members of diverse ethnic, racial, religious or social groups maintain an autonomous participation in and development of their traditional culture or special interest within confines of a common civilization.[17]

[16] Adapted from Laurence D. Haskew, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[17] *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*. Springfield, Mass.: G & C Merriam Company, 1973, p. 885.

Within the confines of a common civilization, pluralism can be both a source of strength and a solid foundation for any society. It should provide the nourishment a dynamic and growing society needs.

But if the manifestations of pluralism are not to be blamed for the ills of the big cities, to what might those ills be attributed?

Perhaps one answer to the above question may be found in a possible confusion regarding the difference between a pluralistic society and a fragmented society. In a pluralistic society there is a central or unifying entity, while in a fragmented society the concept of separatedness becomes central. There are indications that our social systems, especially in big cities, may be characterized more by separatedness than by pluralism.

Such characterization seems to be the case in the various agencies concerned with education and governance in the urban centers. Under the aegis of federal and state agencies, many categorical programs have been developed. The Model Cities Program, the Community Action Program, Manpower Development Programs and Title I of ESEA are but a few examples of such programs in big cities. Each program requires its own guidelines, delivery system, required machinery, performance requirements and so on, and tends to create territory that must be protected from any incursion or encroachment. The desire to protect one's perceived turf or territory has posed a major dilemma for many big city educational systems. The separatedness or fragmentation that permits components of education and big city governance to engage in noncoordinated and counterproductive efforts must be reduced or eliminated before the educational systems of the big cities can do the job expected of them.

Some Recent Developments and Insights

The challenges confronting big city school systems are numerous, diverse and complex. They may be described in a variety of ways and counted in different manners. And they may be approached, alleviated or solved through the utilization of differing techniques. But with all the differences that might be observed, there is one

all important thread of commonality in the problems of the big city schools: *each problem quite directly affects the ultimate well-being of every learner in every classroom.*

Fortunately, many educators and other concerned citizens have begun to develop ways of meeting the challenges and resolving the problems. Many large cities have begun to plan seriously for the improvement not only of education but also of other aspects of government and life in the cities by:

- Determining goals and objectives;
- Identifying the unmet needs;
- Identifying feasible alternatives and selecting the most appropriate and defensible ways of attaining the goals;
- Agreeing on priorities for implementation;
- Preparing for implementation and implementing the plans;
- Assessing progress and revising plans as needed.

Similarly, there has been a growing recognition of the need to decentralize the huge bureaucracies of the big cities, and serious efforts have been made in some cities to accomplish this. Such efforts emphasize the need for bona fide cooperative endeavors, and as a result there have been promising developments along these lines, including:

- Planning and providing for more appropriate facilities, and for multiple use of those facilities;
- Identification and employment of personnel prepared to facilitate relevant learning under difficult conditions and to actively seek the cooperation of parents and others;
- Efforts to modernize the curriculum and adapt programs to the needs of those who will be involved; and

- Serious attempts to enlist the cooperation of state and federal agencies, universities and city government in revitalizing educators.

Next Steps

As someone once observed, when a problem has been properly identified and defined, 75 per cent of the solution has been provided. Whether or not this is true in the case of big city schools may be a moot point. But throughout the big city school system, there is an increasing awareness that the problems exist. State education agencies and leaders are bolstering their efforts to help the large city school systems, and the large city school systems themselves are engaging in a variety of activities designed to correct the dilemmas which have been described.

If the system of public education that has developed and grown during the first two centuries of this nation's existence is to continue to flourish, it is essential that solutions to these vexing problems be found, and found soon. Big city school systems constitute the major portion of the American education system. They can and must survive, but they can do this only if they demonstrate, through their actions, a will to survive and a sound basis for survival.

Chapter 3

PREPARING TO MEET THE CHALLENGES AND NEEDS

In the earlier sections of this monograph considerable emphasis has been placed on the *problems* of the education systems of the large cities. The emphasis has been deliberate and intentional; it should help everyone to recognize that major problems exist in the cities and to understand the seriousness and complexity of the basic issues. More important, the emphasis upon these problems should serve to underscore the urgent need for positive action to alleviate the problems.

During the past several years, various organizations and government agencies have become seriously concerned over the issues and problems of big city governance. Many such groups have attempted to develop practical solutions for the problems of the big cities and for the urban school systems. But while some of the proposed solutions have worked fairly well in specific situations, others have been somewhat less than successful to date. It is important to note the kinds of approaches that have been taken and to consider the "how and why" of each.

Cooperative Arrangements

In Section 2 the need for a new or different kind of education leadership was discussed. An important facet of this new leadership is a willingness and an ability to work with a variety of groups, agencies and organizations. Education leaders must have the ability and be willing to facilitate cooperative endeavor among the several segments of government with direct interest in public education in the big cities.

The education leadership must demonstrate a willingness and ability to cooperate with those segments of society that are involved in the education systems, but which traditionally have been denied participation in

the operation and governance of those systems. Such segments include parents, students, teachers, other employees of the school systems and other concerned citizens whose only involvement may have been to furnish tax revenues for education.

Education leaders, especially in the larger cities of the nation, will be called upon to demonstrate a clear recognition of the idea that *education is too important to be left only to the educators.* At the same time, these leaders must see clearly the interrelatedness of urban problems and demonstrate a desire and willingness to work with other groups and agencies.

Some Possible Pitfalls

Although the concept of cooperative arrangements is considered good theory by most people, many hesitate to utilize it, and some have seen fit to either abuse or misuse it. It is relatively easy to discuss the concept of cooperative endeavor in a context that will be pleasing to most people; but because of the dangers inherent in presenting only the bright side, some potential problem areas or possible pitfalls should be noted:

- Education leaders urgently need to understand that the problems of education are not the only problems of the big cities and that cooperative endeavors will be needed to solve all the problems—not just those found in the education systems.

- Since education represents only a part of the total problem, consideration will have to be given to the competition that confronts the several social agencies as they seek additional tax dollars. As implied in an earlier section, there may have been an era in which nothing in society seemed to grow smaller; instead, everything apparently grew larger. If this perception appeared valid at some point in time, it obviously is inoperable at the present time, as is perhaps most evident in terms of the total available resources, including tax dollars. There will not be sufficient funds to meet the needs of every agency. As this becomes evident, the competition will tend to become keen, and may even become counter-productive to the achievement of the overall needs of society.

- As education leaders initiate cooperative relationships, they will be working with other professionals who have heavily invested their time and money as they have pursued their own careers in fields other than education. And just as the professional educator may be prone to justify, defend and even expand "his territory," the administrators responsible for other social programs are likely to do the same for their programs.

Education leaders must recognize the problems arising from competition among social agencies for attention, for dollars and for "territorial rights." It is even more important, however, for these leaders to help other leaders to become aware of the problems. When everyone concerned can readily understand the need for more cooperation and less competition, cooperative arrangements will be possible and progress will be made toward solving at least some of the problems of big city education.

Planning and Change

Major changes in the education systems of the large cities have occurred in recent years. However, some such changes have taken place almost as a result of chance or happenstance. Changes in education—especially in the metropolitan centers of the nation, where the problems are acute—must not be haphazard in nature or left only to chance. *Effective changes must be carefully and systematically planned.*

As education leaders prepare to deal with the problems of education, they will need to understand and utilize the closely related processes of planning and change if their efforts are to be productive. The cooperative arrangements mentioned previously are essential. But unless the people involved clearly understand *why* they are being asked to cooperate, *what* can be accomplished through cooperative endeavors and *how* the spirit of cooperation will benefit them, their efforts are likely to be futile. Adequate planning—planning that will result in desired and needed change—is essential. And it is equally essential that the plans include provisions for those strategies most likely to bring about the expected change.

It is somewhat ironic to note that during recent years educators as well as other concerned citizens have not been able to effectively bring about the changes required by an ever-changing society. The irony becomes even more evident when it is recognized that: (1) more is known about change and the change process than ever before and (2) more knowledge and expertise relating to planning are available than at any time in our history. In an era in which there is an abundance of knowledge relating to planning and change, it becomes difficult to understand why so few meaningful and lasting changes have resulted.

Education leaders in the big cities, as they proceed with their efforts, will have to address themselves to the dilemma posed above. They will have to take steps to insure that planning focuses on the means for achieving specified ends. The leadership must prevent the development of a plan from becoming an end in itself.

As leaders in every segment of governance work together to solve common problems, they obviously will have to plan. Hopefully, they will be able to plan together. They should all keep in mind, however, that the basic purpose of planning relates directly to bringing about needed and agreed upon changes designed to correct and improve in some fashion the existing situation. They must recognize the advantages that appropriate planning process offers, including:

- Procedures by which pertinent information can be gathered and analyzed;
- An orderly and systematic procedure for achieving needed changes;
- Procedures for identification of goals, objectives and priorities;
- Procedures for identifying feasible courses of action, based upon established priorities; and

- Provisions and procedures for implementation, evaluation and needed modification.[1]

As education leaders plan solutions for the education problems of big cities, the advantages of "appropriate planning" will provide obvious clues. The advantages, however, must not cause those leaders to lose sight of two important and overriding concepts. First, education leaders in the big cities must always recognize that every education agency or institution has certain unique roles that must be assumed if efforts to improve or strengthen the education systems are to be successful. When the necessary roles of education agencies or institutions are ignored by those in positions of leadership, many education needs are likely to remain unmet. Second, education leaders must also be aware that no agency can be perceived as an island unto itself and that no such agency can long exist in "splendid isolation." In every large city, the educational system must exist in relation to every other segment of society that is to be found there.

The desired result of planning is implementation of needed changes. This can be brought about in large cities in a variety of ways, but virtually every planned change is effected by the employment of one or more basic strategies:

- The involvement and education of people who would be affected. Change occurs as a a result of a better understanding of needs, along with the modification of personal attitudes.

- Change is often brought about through a unilateral imposition of power and authority.

- Change can be brought by rationally describing and demonstrating potential benefits.

Each of the three basic strategies for effecting change has obvious advantages and disadvantages. Education

[1] For a more detailed analysis of this topic the reader is directed to the volume, *Planning and Providing for Excellence in Education*, by Edgar L. Morphet, David L. Jesser and Arthur P. Ludka, New York: Citation Press, 1972.

leaders planning for needed improvements in the big cities will have to examine carefully each strategy in the context of goals that have been agreed upon, and determine which strategy or combination of strategies should be utilized.

Planning and change do not, and should not, exist as separate entities. Needed changes usually will be brought about as the result of well-conceived and carefully considered plans.

Bringing Schools Closer to the People

Appropriate planning procedures and cooperative endeavors are essential if needed improvements in the large city school systems are to be made. By themselves, however, they are not likely to suffice. Neither kind of effort will result in meaningful and lasting changes unless there are procedures through which the people served and affected by the school systems can be involved in the decision-making process.

Such procedures for involvement and participation may not be easy to define, develop and implement, for the long-term trend in public education has been to move governance and participation away from the people. This trend has been especially apparent in the education systems of big cities. Reversing it, or easing it, will call for a highly creative kind of education leadership and represents one of the significant challenges in the education settings of the big cities. But if the efforts to effect improvements are to be productive, such involvement will have to occur; schools must be brought closer to the people.

The problem of providing schools that are "closer to the people" is not new. Nor is it limited to the big cities. It is, however, most serious there and has been responsible for much of the unrest and dissatisfaction associated with education in the big cities in recent years. In some cities, recognition of this problem has led to the development of neighborhood schools, local advisory councils and other "involvement" procedures. These efforts represent only a beginning. Education leaders must implement other, more comprehensive procedures.

The PACTS Program

One such procedure was developed recently in Washington, D.C., under the leadership of Superintendent Barbara Sizemore. The school system of the District of Columbia has been plagued with many of the problems of "bigness," and seemed especially troubled by a bureaucratic and highly centralized administrative structure. In an effort to correct the situation, the central administration of the D.C. schools was decentralized; six area or regional administrative units were created. The decentralization represented an attempt to bring schools closer to the people. The D.C. school system went beyond mere decentralization and established what is known as the PACTS program. In this program there are active groups of Parents, Administrators, Counsellors, Teachers and Students in neighborhoods served by the schools. These groups meet to discuss school problems and make recommendations. The PACTS program is an excellent example of how schools can be brought closer to the people.

The New York Effort

Other attempts have been made to decentralize administrative structures in the large cities. Yet none approach the magnitude of New York City's efforts, which were mandated by the legislature. This has been briefly described in a report prepared for the Education Commission of the States by the New York State Department of Education

The 1967 session of the New York Legislature passed a bill that directed the mayor of New York City to prepare a plan for reorganizing the New York City school system and to submit that plan by December 1, 1967, to the governor, the legislature and the Board of Regents.

Mayor Lindsay appointed a committee to prepare a decentralization plan. McGeorge Bundy of the Ford Foundation served as chairman of the committee and Mario Fantini served as staff director. The mayor had his own education liaison who kept in close touch with the developing decentralization proposals. The board of education named a committee on decentralization head-

ed by John Niemeyer, president of the Bank Street College of Education.

The Bundy Committee issued its report in December 1967 and recommended community control of the education system in New York City, as well as a division of the school district into a large number of community school districts. The report immediately generated heated discussion; almost from the start it was assumed that the specific proposals of the Bundy Committee were never likely to be adopted.[2]

Though the "Bundy Report" contained recommendations almost certain to be opposed by various groups, it was nonetheless the first step in a long and difficult process which led ultimately to the creation of 31 local school districts with their own community school boards within the framework of the New York City education system and under the aegis of the New York City Central Board of Education.

As the New York report indicates, it is still too early to say whether the decentralized system will provide effective governance and solve the education problem. Many of the community boards are operating effectively, some are not; and there are still many conflicts between the central board and the community boards, between the teachers union and the boards and between the school system and the community. These conflicts leave the future of decentralization uncertain.[3]

It is too soon to judge the effectiveness of either the New York City decentralization plan or the PACTS program in Washington. Both, however, represent sincere attempts to relocate the schools closer to the people. Both should be of interest to education leaders in other large cities.

As attempts are made to bring about meaningful and constructive involvement, education leaders will have to ensure that roles and relationships are clear to all

[2] From an unpublished report prepared for ECS by Norman D. Kurland especially for this monograph.

[3] *Ibid.*

participants. Advisory councils, for example, are not intended as policy-making bodies. Yet care should also be taken to guard against the "benevolent despot" attitude that can develop.

In this regard, Crenshaw and Smith have offered salient guidelines:

- *Role of Citizens in Education.* Deeper involvement is advocated and many alternatives are available. The objective is to involve people in a constructive manner in matters of concern to both the educator and the lay citizen.

- *The Idea of Neighborhood Schools.* If the community views the school as a neighborhood school, much involvement can follow naturally. Decentralization could bring citizens more actively into the decision-making process.

- *Public and Private School Relationships.* Interaction is needed between public schools on the one hand and the private schools and colleges on the other. Hundreds of thousands of students are educated in parochial and private schools. Not only do the students of public and private schools need to come together, but also their parents and teachers need to see some common goals of a pluralistic society.

- *Intercultural and Interracial Interaction.* The different ethnic, cultural and racial groups of the community need to share one another's view of life through such intensified experiences as television, radio, cultural fairs, group discussion and the like. Although integrated schools may represent the start of human understanding, the greater community is the true schoolroom of human concern and understanding.

- *Planning Among Civic and Intergovernmental Groups.* It would be interesting to note just how much cooperative planning goes on within and without urban school systems. From school to school, how much planning is there? How much long-range planning is there between education systems and departments of transportation? Comprehen-

sive and coordinated planning would involve schools and communications systems, housing and urban development and commercial interests such as heavy and light industry and shopping centers.

- *Voices of Students.* Not only has the citizen's role in education in the United States become minimal, but the potential role of students has been largely overlooked. There are a few programs where the student voice is beginning to be heard. One such instance is the Philadelphia Parkway Program where high school students choose their own subjects to study and where the facilities of public institutions and businesses serve as classrooms. There are similar programs in Chicago (Metro High School) and in White Plains, New York, (Edu-Cage) that provide alternative student-responsive schools. Such schools indicate trends away from the often oppressive school styles of the past and base their approach on student motivation studies that indicate students learn best what they want to learn and resist imposed programs. Relevance pertains to closing the gap between academic learning and the real world—using such materials as current newspapers, magazines, television and movies.[4]

Recognizing and Removing Constraints

While it is impossible to state definitively that the preceding ideas or concepts will provide solutions for the problems of big city education, it seems likely that they will prove to be helpful. Individuals working together, planning, bringing the schools closer to the people and stimulating involvement at every level are essential to the task of finding plausible and practical answers. But in any attempt to find answers, constraints or other inhibiting factors may go unnoticed until serious delays cause them to be apparent.

A necessary first step in dealing with constraints is the development and utilization of a process whereby they can be readily identified. One such process has been developed by Beard and Foster: (see Figure I)

---

[4]Joseph Crenshaw and Rodney Smith, "Urban Learning Environments, Opportunities, and Procedures," in *Revitalizing Education in the Big Cities*, op. cit. pp. 31-32.

Figure I
CONSTRAINT REMCVAL MATRIX[5]

SOURCES	MAJOR AREAS: Planning and Resource Allocation	Human Talent Utilization	Technology Utilization	Curriculum Concerns	Space and Facilities	Time Utilization	Student Achievement and Accountability	Socio-psycho-logical Factors
Competency	2,3,5,7,9	2,3,5,7,9	2,3,5,7,9	2,3,5,7,9	1,2,3,5	1,2,3,9	2,3,5,7,9	2,3,5,9
Attitude	1,7,8,9.10	1,3,7,8,9.10	1,7,8,9	1,7,8,9	1,7,8,9	1,7,8,9	1,7,8,9	1,7,8,9
Policy	6,8	6,8	6,8	6,8	6,8		6,8	6,8

POSSIBLE STRATEGIES (Number Code)*

1. Rebudget
2. Reallocate
3. Reorganize
4. Restructure
5. Provide Resources
6. Take Required Action
7. Recruit
8. Public Relations
9. Retrain
10. Reward

LOCATION	APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES
Staff	1,2,3,5,7,8,9,10
Constituted Board	6,8
Authority Hierarchy	6,8
Professional Organization	8
Student Body	1,2,3,5,7,8,9,10
Community	7,8,10

*The number code is applicable to the cells and to the location strategies.

[5] Jacob G. Beard and Garret R. Foster, *Manual for the Resource Utilization Analysis Procedure*, Unpublished document (Tallahassee, Fla.: Florida State University, 1971).

The matrix illustrates a strategy that can be used and incorporates the following five steps:

1. Identify the *area* of the action being constrained and classify it under one of the eight categories listed in the columns across the top of the table.

2. Identify the *source* (reason for) of the constraint and classify it within one of the four categories along the horizontal dimension of the table.

3. Identify the *location* of the constraint and categorize it under one of the six headings listed A through F in the table.

4. Find the cell at the intersection of the "area" column and the "source" row. The numbers in the cell may then be matched with the strategy numbers corresponding to the "location" of the constraint. The matching numbers reflect appropriate alternative removal strategies for the type of constraint identified.

5. The last step requires (a) listing alternative strategies as revealed in the matrix, (b) considering all consequences that may follow the employment of each strategy, (c) assessing the feasibility of each set of strategies, (d) deciding whether to act or not and (e) implementing the selected strategy.

As education leaders prepare to deal with forces constraining their efforts to bring about needed improvements, they will have to develop their own strategies for every unique situation. The matrix concept already used, together with suggestions by Crenshaw and Smith, provides additional guidelines:

- Situation, tradition or personality constraints pose a different problem for a system of constraint removal. At this level, one runs into greater difficulty sorting fact from opinion and policy from personality. A system for removing peculiar local constraints must therefore be based on strategies relevant to a variety of different types of local issues and must be approached at a lower level of specificity. The constraint removal system presented above has been

developed on the basis of research in the areas of planned change and education decision processes.

- In the context of constraint removal, a person must deal with resource availability and resource use. A constraint is present either as a result of the dearth of needed resources or because of the manner in which they are being used. Attitudes may become constraint sources when they are the decisive factors in prohibiting necessary or desired changes that in turn effect the availability and use of resources.

- The removal strategy at the local level involves the identification of (1) *the source* of the constraint (the cause or reason a constraint is present), (2) *the location* of a constraint (the place, person, body or structure which gives the constraint power) and (3) *the area affected* by the constraint (the structure, organization or person affected by the constraint).[6]

---

[6] Joseph Crenshaw and Rodney Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-43.

Chapter 4

EMERGING ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

This monograph has been concerned with schooling and education for those millions of Americans who reside in or around the big cities of the nation. The problems, as well as the opportunities, that confront this major segment of the population are indeed unprecedented. The manner in which the problems are faced and the opportunities grasped will dictate in no small measure the progress of the United States during the last quarter of this century.

It is a serious and urgent situation, demanding prompt and direct action. But assuming that everyone agrees on the need for positive action, will that be sufficient to cope with the problems of education in the big cities? Obviously it will not suffice. Much more than recognition of need must occur before the many problem areas will be alleviated. Recognition, however, is a most important first step. It must take place and be shared by all affected by the problem.

But after recognition, what? To whom can the municipal leaders turn for help as the problem areas are faced and strategies initiated? There are several possibilities, each with its own unique set of advantages. Each should be carefully considered; the suitable strategies should be utilized in appropriate ways.

State Education Agencies

The examples of action taken by state education agencies would certainly suggest that this agency is a logical resource to be utilized by those responsible for education change in the large cities. The leadership and concern of the chief state school officer has been demonstrated in numerous states that have already made substantial efforts to assist large cities in solving their problems.

In Ohio for example, an Office of Urban Education was established within the Ohio State Department of Education in the late 1960s.

As clearinghouse for planning and operational experiences in meeting the challenges of urban schools in the 1970s and 1980s, the Office of Urban Education, within the limitations of staff time and funds, assisted in identifying needs and, through conferences and consultations, helped to propose and implement appropriate services. It encouraged project proposals by units inside and outside the department of education. Such innovations required coordination with state, federal and private agencies concerning the granting and allocation of funds. In this effort of coordinating, the office aided each group to make more effective use of the funds at its disposal.

In addition, the Office of Equal Educational Opportunity within the department of education assisted in the development of programs of education in keeping with the potential and needs of the individual as well as the needs of society. Coordination among the Office of Urban Education, its auxiliary resources and the Office of Equal Opportunity provides the impetus for action in implementing needed change.

Supporting the Office of Urban Education are several other auxiliary resource instruments, all geared toward the goal of equality and quality. One is the Committee on Urban School Development. It consists of individuals from outside the department of education who are conversant in various fields of endeavor, have a knowledge of and serious interest in the problems of urban education, and are thus in a position to effectively assist and support the urban education program and be involved in legislative action.

A second group is a Departmental Task Force on Urban Education, composed of personnel within the department of education and with the assistant superintendent as chairman. The function of the task force is to help design and evaluate programs and policies, with appropriate alternatives for recommendation to the superintendent of public instruction.

A third group related to the Office of Urban Education is made up of 30 area coordinators, assigned within the Division of School Finance. Their primary duties are involved with the distribution of funds within the School Foundation Program as passed by the Ohio General Assembly. Offices are situated in 15 regions across the state in order to expedite delivery of the services to our 619 districts. These coordinators assist in making recommendations through the Office of Urban Education that will

insure more efficient and effective urban education programs. Their assistance in establishing guidelines and evaluation techniques has paved the way toward successful approval and implementation of special learning activities for the disadvantaged.

Through utilization of these resources the Office of Urban Education issues periodic reports on needs, programs, operational experiences and projections as they relate to the educational problems in urban schools, both within and out of state. The office has been helpful in accelerating, advancing and achieving quality integrated education in urban school districts of Ohio which represent "the modern frontier in education."[1]

The efforts of the Ohio State education agency, under the leadership of Superintendent Martin Essex and Assistant Superintendent for Urban Education Robert Greer, have resulted in a high degree of awareness and cohesiveness on the part of personnel within the department and among persons external to the department.

In Texas, under the leadership of Commissioner J. W. Edgar and James B. Morgan, Assistant Commissioner for Urban Education, and in cooperation with the Improving State Leadership in Education (ISLE) project, an effort was initiated in 1970 to:

- Identify the concerns and problems of Texas' urban school districts;
- Describe the roles the Texas Education Agency should perform in assisting the urban school districts in resolving their concerns and problems; and
- Determine specific strategies, processes and procedures for implementing the roles and actions required by both the agency and urban school districts in resolving major concerns and problems.

Three distinct groups worked together in implementing and completing the study: (1) the project staff, (2) the

[1] "Improving the Learning Environment, Opportunities and Procedures Through Ohio Education Agency/Urban School District Relationships." Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Education, 1973. (Mimeo paper), pp. 8-9.

Urban Advisory Committee and (3) the Texas Education Agency's Continuing Committee on Urban Education. These have been described as follows:

Project Staff. Responsibility for the project was assigned to the director of the Division of Program Planning, Texas Education Agency. In addition to his staff, an independent education consultant (Dr. Maurice Dutton) from the consulting firm, ARBEC, Inc., was employed as the project coordinator, and a professor from the College of Education at the University of Texas at Austin (Dr. L. D. Haskew) was employed as a special consultant. This group developed the general design for the study, organized the advisory committee, provided general administrative support, gathered pertinent information, made reports and recommendations to the advisory committee and implemented recommendations of the advisory committee.

Urban Advisory Committee. The Urban Advisory Committee was appointed by the commissioner of education and was composed of the superintendents of Texas' seven largest school districts, the dean of the college of education at the University of Houston, the executive director of the Region XIX Education Service Center in El Paso, the state coordinator of the Model Cities Program (a member of the Governor's Planning Committee) and the chairman of the Texas Education Agency's Continuing Committee on Urban Education.

The superintendents on the advisory committee represent the largest urban districts in Texas. The other members of the advisory committee were selected because they had considerable knowledge of and vital interests in public education in the state and could make contributions from different perspectives.

The purpose of the advisory committee was to provide overall guidance and direction to the study, to discuss and react to the reports and recommendations given to it and to make recommendations for specific actions to the project staff, to the Texas Education Agency and to the urban school districts.

This committee worked with the project director and coordinator in identifying and codumenting urban education problems. The focus was on current problems and those likely to be encountered during the next decade. Relationships between the state education agency and urban school systems which retard the solution of the urgent problems and some of the causes and possible solutions for these problems were considered.

Continuing Committee on Urban Education. When the project began in September of 1970, the Texas Education Agency had a Task Force on Urban Education. (The agency establishes task forces on a temporary basis to deal with specific problems.) In November, the task force was replaced by the Continuing Committee on Urban Education. This gave greater status to the group and greater recognition to the tasks it faced in dealing with the problems associated with urban education. The membership was also "upgraded" by assigning division directors to the continuing committee.

The Continuing Committee on Urban Education was established by the commissioner of education's Coordinating Council to support the agency's capability to deal with the special concerns of urban education in Texas. It was determined that the early activities of the continuing committee would be correlated with the findings and activities of the study.[2]

Differing approaches have been taken by state education agencies in other states, but all have aimed at solving the education problems of the large cities. Arizona identified the need for coordination among urban and suburban school districts as a prime concern, and with the help of state education agency personnel, positive steps were taken to develop such coordination. Colorado, taking a different direction, identified problems confronting the Mexican-American student in an urban setting as being of major importance. An effort was made to resolve, or to develop guidelines for the resolution of, the problems. Michigan, with its large industrial urban cities, focused on problems relating to the development of curricular materials relevant to ethnic minorities found in cities.

In the states mentioned, and in every state not mentioned, the state education agency is a valuable resource and should be utilized by education leaders of the big cities to assist in finding plausible solutions to their problems.

---

[2] J. B. Morgan and Maurice Dutton, "A Case Study of Improving Relationships Between Urban School Districts and the Texas Education Agency." Austin, Tex.: Texas Education Agency, 1974. (Unpublished paper prepared especially for the Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.)

Consortia of Local Administrators

In several states, including Texas and Colorado, the administrators of education systems within metropolitan areas have organized into consortium arrangements to develop programs to ease the problems of big city education. Such arrangements exist in other areas, as well as in the framework of organizations such as the American Association of School Administrators.

Existing consortia arrangements, formal or informal, should certainly be utilized. Where such arrangements do not exist or are not feasible, new arrangements, limited only by the creativity of those affected, can and should be structured.

Institutions of Higher Education

While it may not be a valid observation universally, it is nevertheless probable that a given metropolitan or urban area is served by some institution of higher education. It is also probable that such an institution or set of institutions will have a direct interest in the problems of the education systems of the areas served by the institutions. Many postsecondary institutions have agencies or departments geared to education planning, and it would seem entirely appropriate for such agencies to be actively involved in solving education problems in the big city metropolitan situation.

Intra-governmental Efforts

At every level of governance—federal, state and local—there exist opportunities for productive collaborative arrangements. Federal agencies, such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, have common concerns and some common approaches to the solution of problems. But there must be initiative on the part of those affected if there are to be effective common approaches. Inasmuch as cooperative endeavors among federal agencies are becoming a reality, they should be utilized by those concerned; and to the extent that it is not true, correctional efforts will be needed.

AFTERWORD

Americans invented many ways to shape the schooling they need and want. Much of their influence is exerted through voluntary, do-it-yourself channels and direct people-to-people interchanges. We cannot do without this method in the future, for it ultimately determines what takes place when school and students come together. In their wisdom, however, Americans are increasingly trying all levels of government as prime channels for working out schooling to suit the needs of the nation.

It is in this sense of cooperation—not only between the federal, state and local levels of government, but throughout the entire governance system—that the quality of the education program will continue to develop and improve.